

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DECEMBER 21, 2009

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Harold Sanger
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Craig S. Owens, City Manager
Jim Liberman
Marc Lopata
Scott Wilson
Ron Reim (arrived at 5:36 p.m.)

Absent:

None

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney (arrived at 5:45 p.m.)

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES

The minutes of the December 7, 2009 meeting were presented for approval. Marc Lopata asked that clarification be made on Page 19 regarding the question if the product was a Japanese product, as he was familiar with the Japanese product. The minutes were then approved, as amended, after having been previously distributed to each member.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 203 LINDEN

Clinton Enyeart, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed project consists of a 2-story brick single-family residence with a three-car below grade, side entry garage. The site measures approximately 12,987 square feet and is located in Old Town. The proposed structure measures approximately 6,800 square feet with a height of 30-feet as determined from the average existing grade to the midpoint of the roof. The R-2 Zoning District allows building height up to 30 feet. The existing site contains 36.7% impervious area. The new plans show impervious coverage at 46.7% of the site. The existing storm water runoff is 0.73 cubic feet per second. Storm water runoff on the proposed site plan will increase to 0.78 cubic feet per second (a difference of 0.05 CFS). Storm water will be piped to the existing storm sewer on Pershing. To mitigate the increase in impervious coverage, the applicant is proposing to construct the entire driveway with pervious pavers. The paver system will contain an under drain that will tie-in to the storm sewer lateral. Trash will be enclosed below the front porch. The HVAC units will be located on the roof, above the screened porch and screened with planting containers. A total of 81.4-caliper inches of trees are to be removed which require replacement. Included in these removals are three (3) mature oak trees. The landscape plan provides a replacement of 83 caliper-inches. In addition to the smaller species, three shade trees are proposed as replacements, including one (1) red oak and two (2) sugar maples. Two trees will be impacted by construction and are shown to be protected. Catherine indicated that the proposed site is being developed in a similar fashion as other corner properties in this area. The impervious coverage and run-off are increasing and the applicant is proposing a storm sewer connection and pervious pavers to handle the increased run-off. The proposal requires the removal of several mature trees. The applicant is proposing to replace the three (3) shade trees with three (3) similar replacement trees. Two (2) trees will be impacted by construction. The City's contracted Landscape Architect should perform an inspection of the tree protection fencing prior to construction activity on the site. In addition, a landscape bond in the amount of \$5,040 (42-caliper inches of impacted trees at \$120 per inch) should be provided prior to building permit issuance. The trees are to be inspected by the City's contract Landscape Architect one-year after the occupancy permit has been issued. If the trees have been determined to be in poor condition, they are to be replaced. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to approve as submitted with the following conditions:

1. That the City's contracted Landscape Architect perform a site inspection prior to commencement of construction activity to approve the tree protection fencing.
2. That a landscape bond in the amount of \$5,040 (42-caliper inches of tree impact at \$120 per inch) be provided prior to building permit issuance.
3. That the impacted trees be inspected by the City's contracted Landscape Architect one-year after the occupancy permit has been issued. If the trees have been determined to be in poor condition, they must be replaced according the requirements of the City.

Catherine advised the members that staff was advised earlier today that the applicant may utilize a geothermal system and/or that the locations of the HVAC units may be changed. She indicated

that if the something gets changed from what is depicted on the plans before them, a new site plan will have to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Mr. Enyeart began a PowerPoint presentation.

A slide depicting the site plan, existing and proposed, was presented. Locations of the structure, driveway and trees were shown. Mr. Enyeart explained that the site falls 8 feet from the northwest to the southeast. He stated that the project included permeable paving for the driveway and protection for two street trees. He stated that there will be container plantings on the roof. He stated that the differential runoff is 0.05 cfs.

Scott Wilson asked if the gutters tie into the storm sewer.

Mr. Enyeart replied "yes".

Marc Lopata asked the difference (in square footage) of impervious coverage between existing and new.

Mr. Enyeart replied "1,200 square feet".

Marc Lopata stated that the calculations were done in acreage, not square footage.

Mr. Enyeart stated that it is closer to 1,300 square feet.

Marc Lopata asked for comparison of the project's impervious coverage and tree caliper inches lost to other single family new construction projects. He also asked for the proposed revisions to the landscape ordinance applied to this project.

Elizabeth Simons stated that staff had internally reviewed these comparisons and that the project falls slightly above the trend line for impervious coverage and further above the trend line for caliper inches lost.

Jason Jaggi informed the members that with the proposed revisions to the landscape ordinance, this project would require a larger than appropriate bond amount. Additionally, the sizes of the proposed trees are smaller than would be required under the new ordinance; however, the types of trees being replaced are similar to those being lost, which is desired.

Catherine Powers noted that there is still much work to do on the preparation of the landscape ordinance.

Marc Lopata asked Mr. Enyeart what measures will be taken to keep sediment from running into the storm drain.

Mr. Enyeart indicated that there will be a silt fence around the edge of the property.

Marc Lopata asked what will be done with the scrap wood.

Mr. Enyeart stated that the contractor will make that decision.

Chairman Sanger asked if the client understands that there is maintenance required for the pervious driveway.

Mr. Enyeart indicated that there is an adequate drainage underbed for the pervious paver.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed residence will be approximately 6,800 square feet including the finished portions of the basement. The height of the proposed residence will be 30 feet as measured from the existing grade to the top of the mansard roof. The proposed pool house will be 107 square feet in size and 12' in height as measured from the proposed pool deck to the midpoint of the roof slope. The proposed residence will be grey brick and limestone. The mansard roof will be blue-grey Slate line. The below grade, front entry garage to the north will have a dark grey carriage style door with diagonal wood panels. Windows will have black steel frames. The pool house will use the same design and materials as the residence. Trash will be enclosed below the eastern patio and screened by a brick wall. Rooftop condensing units will be screened by a hedge of container plantings. A 205 square foot patio to the east and a 350 square foot patio to the south will be surrounded by black steel guardrails. These patios will be at grade with the top of retaining walls not greater than 4' in height. Catherine stated that the proposed residence is large, but similar in size to other new houses in the area. The proposed design and materials will give the structure a strong presence on this corner lot. The rooftop HVAC units should be fully screened with a permanent solution. Catherine stated that staff's recommendation is to approve as submitted with the condition that plans for full rooftop screening be submitted for staff review and approval.

Mr. Enyeart informed the members that the 20 foot in width garage door has been relocated to the north, but will be set back only 8 to 12 inches, versus 15 feet. He indicated that they are exploring the possibility of using a geothermal HVAC system, but no final decision has been made.

Slides depicting floor plans and elevations were presented.

Chairman Sanger asked if the flat roof will be reflective.

Mr. Enyeart replied "yes".

Chairman Sanger stated that he is concerned that the roof will be visible to the neighbor and that the light from this white reflective roof would reflect into the neighbor's house.

Mr. Enyeart stated that based on the elevation that should not be a problem.

City staff indicated that the roof is acceptable.

Mr. Enyeart indicated that the structure is not as massive as the houses on either side.

Jim Liberman asked about material samples.

Mr. Enyeart presented a sample of the roof (Slate line).

Chairman Sanger asked if this would be considered a mansard roof.

Mr. Enyeart replied “yes”.

Chairman Sanger asked if a mansard roof is allowed in a Design District.

Catherine Powers indicated that the property is not located in a Design District.

Mr. Enyeart presented a sample of the steel window, stating that it is Energy Star qualified. A sample of the brick was also presented. He indicated that the brick will be painted to match the limestone.

Marc Lopata commented that using asphalt shingles on a luxurious house would not compliment the residence.

Catherine Powers stated that there are no provisions on the use of asphalt, but that an upgrade in roofing materials would be recommended.

Mr. Enyeart stated that the proposed asphalt shingles mimic Slate.

Scott Wilson asked if the use of the proposed asphalt shingles is a cost or structural issue.

Chairman Sanger asked if Slate can be used on a mansard roof.

Mr. Enyeart replied “yes”. He stated that asphalt shingles are proposed to minimize maintenance.

Marc Lopata asked the brand of the window.

Mr. Enyeart replied “Hopes”. He stated they have an R-value of .35 (Energy Star requirement is .4).

Marc Lopata commented that Hopes is not an Energy Star manufacturer.

Mr. Enyeart stated that Hopes is not an approved manufacturer, but meets Energy Star requirements.

Marc Lopata stated that he would like to see a material other than asphalt.

Catherine Powers commented that the use of real slate is not a requirement.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve with the exclusion of the recommendation for rooftop screening of condensing units.

Catherine Powers indicated that if a geothermal system is utilized, no screening would be required; however, if units are placed on the roof, screening would be necessary. She asked that either way, revised plans be submitted for staff approval.

Steve Lichtenfeld amended his motion to require the submittal of revised HVAC plans to staff for their approval. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE – 8049 CLAYTON ROAD (I-HOP)

Michael Curran, construction manager, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for new signage at the I-HOP Restaurant. The proposed ground sign will be located in the front yard facing Clayton Road. The 24.5 square foot double-sided internally illuminated monument sign will contain routed lettering on an aluminum cabinet. The sign will be placed on a red brick base. The architectural plans show a limestone cap at the top of the cabinet. The sign company's drawing does not show this feature. The wall sign measures approximately 27 square feet and will be placed above the entry on the west-side of the building. The sign will contain individually lit channel letters featuring the IHOP logo and an "Open 24 Hours" text. The existing roof sign will be removed and replaced with the above wall sign and ground sign. Catherine indicated that the IHOP restaurant is undergoing significant renovation which will greatly enhance the appearance of the building. The proposed signage is appropriate for the use and is in conformance with the size requirements of the Sign Ordinance. A landscape plan was required by the Architectural Review Board as part of the condition of approval for the site plan associated with the renovation of the restaurant. Staff would like to see the landscape plan incorporate the area adjacent to the monument sign for an improved appearance. Additionally, staff would prefer that the limestone cap be installed on the brick wall for an improved appearance and recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the monument sign contain landscaping at the base to be approved by staff prior to permit approval
2. That the top of the brick base contain the limestone cap as shown on the architect's drawing prepared by Rangwala Associates.

Mr. Curran stated that the monument sign will capture motorists before they go under the overpass.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that the plans indicate that there will also be a “welcome” sign. He asked if that fits within the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Currant stated that the welcome signs are simply placards; they are not illuminated.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff would need to review any additional signage.

Jason Jaggi stated that permits have been applied for the wall signs. Details for the proposed welcome signs have not been provided and therefore, not allowed at this time.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Currant if he understands staff recommendations.

Mr. Currant replied “yes”.

Chairman Sanger asked when they plan to open for business.

Mr. Currant indicated that they hope to open at the beginning of the year.

Jim Liberman made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

CITY BUSINESS – DISCUSSION OF REVISED REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

Catherine indicated that at the November 16, 2009 Plan Commission meeting, staff presented four options regarding amendments to Zoning Regulations pertaining to impervious coverage and storm water. At the December 7, 2009 Plan Commission meeting, staff presented illustrations of how previously approved single family developments would be affected if the impervious coverage was reduced to 50% and 45%. Also at this meeting, existing impervious coverage regulations in other communities were summarized. Staff distributed information on single family impervious and building coverage regulations in other communities.

Catherine indicated that at the November 16, 2009 Plan Commission meeting, staff proposed the following option:

- Set impervious coverage maximum at 50% of the total lot for residential uses in the R-1 through R-3 Zoning Districts
- For new or two-family construction: require any increase in run-off to provide mitigation by installing a storm water BMP
- For large residential additions requiring site plan review: any increase in run-off of 0.05 CFS or greater to provide mitigation by installing a storm water BMP

Catherine stated that staff continues to believe that the above stated option represents a fair and balanced approach by limiting impervious coverage and by making distinctions between new construction and additions for storm water management. She indicated that the reduction of impervious coverage is not an incentive based program, it is simply a reduction to a maximum of

50% coverage and that storm water run-off increase would require a Best Management Practice (BMP).

Chairman Sanger asked how the reductions would impact the Urban Design Districts.

Catherine Powers indicated that the maximum coverage base would remain at 45%, but that a bonus of up to 50% coverage would be allowed dependant on placement of the garage.

Jason Jaggi clarified that 55% coverage would no longer be permitted anywhere.

Chairman Sanger asked the justification for reduction.

Catherine Powers stated that lots are being covered with accessory features and excess impervious surfaces. A reduction in impervious coverage maximum aids in the preservation of greenspace and trees and reduces the burden on storm water infrastructure.

Chairman Sanger stated that when these revisions are presented to the development community, the City will need to provide objective reasons for the changes.

Scott Wilson suggested providing the developers with the background material that has been presented to this Commission.

Chairman Sanger asked what staff would like this Commission to do at this time.

Catherine Powers requested that a motion be made to meet with the Trustees to discuss this item.

Scott Wilson made a motion to approve a meeting with the Trustees.

Marc Lopata asked what storm water BMPs will be acceptable.

Ron Reim asked that a list be prepared and submitted.

The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

Catherine Powers informed the Commission that she has accepted a position with Franklin, Tennessee and will be leaving the City of Clayton. She stated that she will miss everyone.

Chairman Sanger stated that Catherine will be missed. He indicated that this will be his last meeting until March.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Recording Secretary